



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,492	07/25/2003	Gregg E. Skow	H0003921	4206
128 7590 04/09/2007 HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			EXAMINER LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/09/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/627,492

Applicant(s)

SKOW, GREGG E.

Examiner

Kimberly Lovel

Art Unit

2167

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 37-49 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 and 37-49 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                           | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 18 December 2006.
2. Claims 1-29 and 37-49 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 15, 37 and 49 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 18 December 2006, claims 1 has been amended. This action is made Final.
3. The rejections of claims 1-29 and 37-48 as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,879,976 to Brookler et al in view of US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al and claim 49 as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,134,500 to Tang et al in view of US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al have been maintained.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. The rejections of claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter have been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1- 29 and 37-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,879,976 to Brookler et al (hereafter Brookler et al) in view of US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al.

**Referring to claim 1**, Brookler et al disclose a database. In particular, Brookler et al disclose a program product, comprising:

a) a database that is compatible with multiple end-user systems (see column 4, lines 54-61), the database comprising:

a data section [tables] that includes a plurality of data records (see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3, item 300 – the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

a structure section [schema] (see column 4, lines 54-57 – the schema is considered to represent the structure section; according to the 5<sup>th</sup> Edition of Microsoft's Computer Dictionary, a schema defines aspects of the database, such as attributes, domains and parameters of the attributes)

b) at least one physical computer-readable medium having said database stored thereon (see column 4, lines 49-53).

However, Brookler et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of a feature mask. Hartman et al teach a similar database (see abstract), including at least a feature mask [bit mask], the feature mask including data that indicates whether a particular one of the data records is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (see column 8, lines 54-60 and column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask of the query

profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible; the query profile can represent the user profile).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Hartman et al's concept of a feature mask as a feature Brookler et al's database . One would have been motivated to do so to increase the efficiency of retrieving query results from an indexed data set (Brookler et al: see column 1, lines 48-57).

**Referring to claim 2**, the combination of Brookler et al and Hartman et al (hereafter Brookler/Hartman) discloses the program product of claim 1, wherein:

each data record has one or more features [attributes] associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14); and

the feature mask data indicates whether each feature of a data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 3**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 2, wherein:

each data record includes at least a feature field containing one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14); and

the feature mask includes one or more feature mask records, each feature mask record including at least one or more compatibility fields each containing one or more bits that indicate whether a particular one of the data records is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 4**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 1, wherein:

the data section comprises a plurality of data tables, each data table including a plurality of the data records (Brookler et al: see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3 – *the plurality of data tables* are represented by the Products Table, the Manufacturers Table and the Categories Table; the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

the structure section comprises a plurality of features masks, each feature mask at least associated with one of the data tables and including data that indicates whether a particular one of the data records in an associated data table is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 5**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 4, wherein:

each data record in each data table includes at least a feature field containing one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14);

and each feature mask includes a plurality of feature mask records, each feature mask record including at least one or more feature mask values that indicate whether a particular one of the data records in the associated data table is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 6**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 1, wherein the structure section further comprises a system identification table that includes data that uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26 – the user profile and client profile databases are considered to represent the information that *uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems*).

**Referring to claim 7**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 6, wherein the system identification table comprises a plurality of system identification records, each system identification record associated with each of the end-user systems (Brookler et al: see column 7, lines 16-26 – client profiles include information such as

software versions, processor type, processor speed, memory size, modem type, etc.; the client profiles are related to the user profiles).

**Referring to claim 8**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 1, wherein:

the data section comprises a plurality of data tables, each data table including a plurality of the data records (Brookler et al: see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3 – *the plurality of data tables* are represented by the Products Table, the Manufacturers Table and the Categories Table; the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

the structure section further comprises a table pointer table that includes data that uniquely describes at least each of the data tables (Hartman et al: see column 7, lines 37-43).

**Referring to claim 9**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 8, wherein: the table pointer table comprises a plurality of table pointer records; and at least one table pointer record is associated with each of the data tables (Hartman et al: see column 7, lines 37-48).

**Referring to claim 10**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 9, wherein each table pointer record includes data representative of at least: a location of the associated data table; a number of the data records in the associated table (Brookler et al: see column 6, lines 10-24); and a size of each data record in the associated data table.



**Referring to claim 11**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 1, wherein:

each data record includes one or more fields (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 53-54 and Fig 3, item 300 – the fields are product ID, description, manufacturer and category); and

the structure section further comprises a field definition table that includes at least data representative of each of the data record fields (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 56-59 – the lookup table is considered to represent *the field definition table*).

**Referring to claim 12**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 11, wherein the structure section further comprises one or more return type tables, each return type table including data representative of a format of each of the data record fields (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39).

**Referring to claim 13**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 1, further comprising: a header section that includes data representative of indicia that is used to identify the database (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 47-54).

**Referring to claim 14**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the program product of claim 13, wherein the header section further includes data representative of a location of the structure section (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-54).

**Referring to claim 15**, Brookler et al discloses a method of generating a database. In particular, Brookler et al disclose a method of generating a database that is compatible with multiple end-user systems (see column 4, lines 54-61), the method comprising the steps of:

generating a data section [tables] (see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3, item 300); and

storing a plurality of data records in the data section (see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3, item 300 – the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*).

However, Brookler et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of a feature mask. Hartman et al teach a similar method (see abstract), including generating a feature mask that includes data that indicates whether a particular one of the stored data records is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (see column 8, lines 54-60 and column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible; the query profile can represent the user profile).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Hartman et al's concept of a feature mask as a feature Brookler et al's database . One would have been motivated to do so to increase the efficiency of retrieving query results from an indexed data set (Brookler et al: see column 1, lines 48-57).

**Referring to claim 16**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising:

associating one or more features with each data record (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14), wherein, the feature mask data indicates whether each feature of a data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al:

Art Unit: 2167

see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 17**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 16 further comprising:

including at least a feature field in each data record (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14);

supplying each feature field with one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14);

including one or more feature mask records in the feature mask (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible); and

supplying each feature mask record with one or more feature mask values that indicate whether a particular one of the data records is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 18**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising:

... dividing the data section into a plurality of data tables that each include a plurality of the data records (Brookler et al: see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3 – *the plurality of data tables* are represented by the Products Table, the Manufacturers Table and the Categories Table; the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

generating a plurality of features masks that are each at least associated with one of the data tables and that each include data indicative of whether a particular one of the data records in an associated data table is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 19**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 18, further comprising:

including at least a feature field in each data record in each data table (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14);

supplying each feature field with one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14); and

including one or more feature mask records in the feature mask; and supplying each feature mask record with one or more feature mask values that indicate whether a particular one of the data records in the associated data table is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line

Art Unit: 2167

28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 20**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising: generating a system identification table that includes data that uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26 – the user profile and client profile databases are considered to represent the information that *uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems*).

**Referring to claim 21**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 20, further comprising: including a plurality of system identification records in the system identification table, each system identification record associated with each of the end-user systems (Brookler et al: see column 7, lines 16-26 – client profiles include information such as software versions, processor type, processor speed, memory size, modem type, etc.; the client profiles are related to the user profiles).

**Referring to claim 22**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising:

dividing the data section into a plurality of data tables that each include a plurality of the data records (Brookler et al: see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3 – *the plurality of data tables* are represented by the Products Table, the Manufacturers Table and the Categories Table; the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records; which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

generating a table pointer table that includes data that uniquely describes at least each of the data tables (Hartman et al: see column 7, lines 37-48).

**Referring to claim 23**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 22 further comprising: including a plurality of table pointer records in the table pointer table, at least one table pointer record is associated with each of the data tables (Hartman et al: see column 7, lines 37-48).

**Referring to claim 24**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 23, further comprising: supplying each table pointer record with data representative of at least (i) a location of the associated data table, (ii) a number of the data records in the associated table (Brookler et al: see column 6, lines 10-24) and (iii) a size of each data record in the associated data table.

**Referring to claim 25**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising:

including one or more fields in each data record (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 53-54 and Fig 3, item 300 – the fields are product ID, description, manufacturer and category); and

generating a field definition table that includes at least data representative of each of the data record fields (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 56-59 – the lookup table is considered to represent *the field definition table*).

**Referring to claim 26**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 25, further comprising: generating one or more return type tables, each return type table

including data representative of a format of each of the data record fields (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39).

**Referring to claim 27**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising:

generating a structure section and including the feature mask therein (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39);

generating a header section (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39); and  
supplying the header section with data representative of indicia that is used to identify the database (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39).

**Referring to claim 28**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 27, wherein the header section further includes data representative of a location of the structure section (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39).

**Referring to claim 29**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the method of claim 15, further comprising:

including at least a feature field in each data record (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 53-54 and Fig 3, item 300 – the fields are product ID, description, manufacturer and category);

supplying each feature field with data representative of one or more features associated with each data record, wherein the feature field of the data record having the requested data is compared with at least a portion of the feature mask to determine whether the requested data is compatible with the end-user system (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the

*feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 37**, Brookler et al disclose a computer system. In particular, Brookler et al disclose a computer system (see column 4, lines 15-61), comprising:

a processor (see column 4, lines 32-44);

memory in operable communication with the processor (see column 4, lines 48-61); and

a database stored in the memory, the database compatible with multiple end-user systems (see column 4, lines 54-61) and including:

a data section [tables] that includes a plurality of data records (see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3, item 300), and a structure section [schema] (see column 4, lines 54-57).

However, Brookler et al fail to explicitly teach the further limitation of a feature mask. Hartman et al teach a similar database (see abstract), including a feature mask, the feature mask including data that indicates whether a particular one of the data records is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (see column 8, lines 54-60 and column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible; the query profile can represent the user profile).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Hartman et al's concept of a feature mask as a feature Brookler et al's database. One would have been motivated to do so to increase the



Art Unit: 2167

efficiency of retrieving query results from an indexed data set (Brookler et al: see column 1, lines 48-57).

**Referring to claim 38**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 37, wherein:

each data record has one or more features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14); and

the feature mask data indicates whether each feature of a data record is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 39**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 37, wherein:

each data record includes at least a feature field containing one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14); and

the feature mask includes one or more feature mask records, each feature mask record including at least one or more compatibility fields each containing one or more bits that indicate whether a particular one of the data records is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query

Art Unit: 2167

profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 40**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 37, wherein:

the data section comprises a plurality of data tables, each data table including a plurality of the data records (Brookler et al: see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3 – *the plurality of data tables* are represented by the Products Table, the Manufacturers Table and the Categories Table; the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

the structure section comprises a plurality of features masks, each feature mask at least associated with one of the data tables and including data that indicates whether a particular one of the data records in an associated data table is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 41**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 40, wherein:

each data record in each data table includes at least a feature field containing one or more feature bits that represent each of the features associated therewith (Hartman et al: see column 5, lines 3-14); and

each feature mask includes a plurality of feature mask records, each feature mask record including at least one or more compatibility fields each containing one or more bits that indicate whether a particular one of the data records in the associated data table is compatible with one or more of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

**Referring to claim 42**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 37, wherein the structure section further comprises a system identification table that includes data that uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems (Hartman et al: see column 6, lines 25-38 and column 7, lines 16-26 – the user profile and client profile databases are considered to represent the information that *uniquely identifies each of the end-user systems*).

**Referring to claim 43**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 42, wherein the system identification table comprises a plurality of system identification records, each system identification record associated with each of the end-user systems (Brookler et al: see column 7, lines 16-26 – client profiles include information such as software versions, processor type, processor speed, memory size, modem type, etc.; the client profiles are related to the user profiles).

**Referring to claim 44**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 37, wherein:

the data section comprises a plurality of data tables, each data table including a plurality of the data records (Brookler et al: see column 4, lines 54-57; Fig 2, item 6; and Fig 3 – *the plurality of data tables* are represented by the Products Table, the Manufacturers Table and the Categories Table; the Products Table, which is one of the tables in the *data section*, has 5 records, which is considered to represent a *plurality of records*); and

the structure section further comprises a table pointer table that includes data that uniquely describes at least each of the data tables (Hartman et al: see column 7, lines 37-43).

**Referring to claim 45**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 44, wherein: the table pointer table comprises a plurality of table pointer records; and at least one table pointer record is associated with each of the data tables (Hartman et al: see column 7, lines 37-43).

**Referring to claim 46**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 45, wherein each table pointer record includes data representative of at least: a location of the associated data table; a number of the data records in the associated table (Brookler et al: see column 6, lines 10-24); and a size of each data record in the associated data table.

**Referring to claim 47**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the database of claim 37, wherein:

each data record includes one or more fields (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 53-54 and Fig 3, item 300 – the fields are product ID, description, manufacturer and category); and

the structure section further comprises a field definition table that includes at least data representative of each of the data record fields (Brookler et al: see column 5, lines 56-59 – the lookup table is considered to represent *the field definition table*).

**Referring to claim 48**, Brookler/Hartman discloses the system of claim 47, wherein the structure section further comprises one or more return type tables, each return type table including data representative of a format of each of the data record fields (Hartman et al: see column 4, lines 35-39).

7. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,134,500 to Tang et al (hereafter Tang et al) in view of US Patent No 6,804,664 to Hartman et al.

**Referring to claim 49**, Tang et al disclose a flight management system (see abstract), comprising:

Memory [mainframe] (see column 8, lines 23-46);  
a navigation database [navigation database] stored in the memory, the navigation database compatible with multiple flight management systems (see column 4, lines 33-63) and including:

a processor configured to generate an aircraft flight plan based at least in part on the navigational data stored in the navigation database (see column 7, lines 14-31).

However, Tang et al fail to explicitly disclose the further limitation, wherein the database includes a data section that includes a plurality of navigational data records, and a structure section that includes a feature mask, the feature mask including data that indicates whether a particular one of the navigational data records is compatible with one or more of the flight management systems. Hartman et al discloses a navigational database [geographic data database 143], including the further limitation wherein a data section that includes a plurality of navigational data records (see column 6, line 59 – column 7, line 3), and a structure section that includes a feature mask, the feature mask including data that indicates whether a particular one of the navigational data records is compatible with one or more of the flight management systems (see column 9, line 44 – column 10, line 28 – the bit mask is considered to represent the *feature mask*; the bit mask of the query profile is compared to the bit mask of the record and if they match, then the two are considered to be compatible).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the feature of feature masking in a navigation database as disclosed by Hartman et al with the navigation database of Tang et al. One would have been motivated to do so in order provide customized flight plans.

***Response to Arguments***

8. On page 14 of the applicant's amendment, applicant argues that "In the Office action it is alleged that Brookler et al discloses a structure section that includes a feature mask". To clarify, the examiner in the Office action alleges that Brookler et al disclose a structure section, however Brookler et al fails to disclose a feature mask.

9. Applicant argues that "Just because a database includes a schema, which just about every database does, does not mean that it includes a structure section."

In regards to Brookler et al, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In this instance, the schema is considered to represent the structure section. To further clarify, according to column 1, lines 28-29, "a schema defines the structure of a database."

10. Applicant continues to argue that Hartman et al "clearly does not disclose, or even remotely suggest, providing a database with a structure section that includes a feature mask having data that indicates whether a particular data record is compatible with one or more end-user systems.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The query profile can represent the user profile which is then matched against the records in the database to determine if the two records match, which is considered to represent compatibility.

11. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the database access manager determines the layout and format of the data records from the data in the structure tables, before providing access to the data in order to decouple the database access manager from the data layout and format) are

Art Unit: 2167

not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

### ***Conclusion***

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.



Art Unit: 2167

**Contact Information**


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

27 March 2007  
kml

  
JOHN COTTINGHAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION